



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,963	12/09/2003	Allen K. Hawley	SVL920030131US1	6440

47069 7590 03/13/2007
KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP
ATTN: IBM54
315 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE, SUITE 210
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, PHILLIP H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2191

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/731,963	Applicant(s) HAWLEY ET AL.	
	Examiner Phillip H. Nguyen	Art Unit 2191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 December 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20070117</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on December 18, 2006.

Claims 1-18 remain pending.

Claim Objections

2. The amendment filed on December 18, 2006 overcomes the objection to claim 5 of previous action. Therefore, claim objection is withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed December 18, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not deemed persuasive.

Applicant asserts that the cited col. 7 discusses the features of a code editor referred to as "Code Insight" is deficient because it does not disclose the limitation of "user selectable preferences that provide different configurations to configure how the code assist function displays proposed candidates for a partial program instruction".

Examiner respectfully disagrees with the allegations as argued. Examiner, in his previous office action, pointed out location in the cited prior art. The cited col. 7 discusses the features of a code editor for displaying context sensitive pop-up windows within a source code file. By default these features are enabled. To disable/re-enable and configure the features, the user invokes an Environment Options dialog box 400. It gives a user options/choices to select which features to disable/re-enable and

Art Unit: 2191

configures the features how the IDE displays the code (methods, events, properties, and so forth) corresponding to the selected features. For example, if a user enables "Code Completion" then upon the user's input of the dot operator, the system automatically displays the properties, methods, and events appropriated to the class next to the current cursor position. Another example, if a user enables "Code Parameters" then user can view the syntax of a method as the user enters it into the code. For these reasons, Examiner maintains the rejections of claims 1, 7, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification. See MPEP 2111 [R-1] Interpretation of Claims-Broadest Reasonable Interpretation. During patent Examination, the pending claims must be given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification. Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. *In re Prater*, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969).

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 3, 5, 9, 11, 15, and 17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1, 7, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sollich (United States Patent No.: US 6,314,559 B1).

As per claim 1:

Sollich discloses an article of manufacture for use in a computer system for configuring a code assist function which suggests candidates responsive to a parsing of a partial program instruction statement, said article of manufacture comprising a computer-useable storage medium having a computer program embodied in said medium which causes the computer system to execute operations comprising:

- displaying a list of user-selectable preferences ("**Environment Options dialog box 400**" Col 7, line 20; also see FIG. 4A), wherein user selectable preferences provide different configurations to configure how the code assist function displays proposed candidates for a partial program instruction ("**To disable/re-enable and configure the features, the user invokes an Environment Options dialog box 400**" Col 7, line 18-20; a user has an option to disable/re-enable and configures the features how the IDE interface displays proposed features);

- allowing user to select one of the user-selectable preferences ("**To disable/re-enable**" col. 7, line 18);
- storing the selected one of the use-selectable preferences ("**To disable/re-enable and configure the features**" col. 7, line 18; **when it configures the selected features, it stores the selected feature in order for IDE to display the code responding to the selected features**); and
- configuring the code assist function to display the proposed candidates for a partial program instruction according to the configuration provided by the selected one of the user-selectable preferences responsive to a parsing of the partial program instruction statement (**it is inherent because IDE must be configured to accept the user selected features in order to display the code corresponding to the selected features**).

As per claim 7:

Sollich discloses a method for use in a computer system for configuring a code assist function which suggests candidates responsive to a parsing of a partial program instruction statement, said method comprising:

- displaying a list of user-selectable preferences ("**Environment Options dialog box 400**" Col 7, line 20; also see FIG. 4A), wherein user selectable preferences provide different configurations to configure how the code assist function displays proposed candidates for a partial program instruction ("**To disable/re-enable and configure the features, the user invokes an**

Environment Options dialog box 400" Col 7, line 18-20; a user has an option to disable/re-enable and configures the features how the IDE interface displays proposed features);

- allowing user to select one of the user-selectable preferences ("To **disable/re-enable**" col. 7, line 18);
- storing the selected one of the use-selectable preferences ("To **disable/re-enable and configure the features**" col. 7, line 18; **when it configures the selected features, it stores the selected feature in order for IDE to display the code responding to the selected features**); and
- configuring the code assist function to display the proposed candidates for a partial program instruction according to the configuration provided by the selected one of the user-selectable preferences responsive to a parsing of the partial program instruction statement (**it is inherent because IDE must be configured to accept the user selected features in order to display the code corresponding to the selected features**).

As per claim 13:

Sollich discloses a computer system for configuring a code assist function which suggests candidates responsive to a parsing of a partial program instruction statement, said computer system comprising:

- a displayed list of user-selectable preferences ("**Environment Options dialog box 400**" Col 7, line 20; also see FIG. 4A);

- a user-selectable preference selected by a user from the list of user-selectable preferences, wherein user selectable preferences provide different configurations to configure how the code assist function displays proposed candidates for a partial program instruction (**"To disable/re-enable and configure the features, the user invokes an Environment Options dialog box 400"** Col 7, line 18-20; **a user has an option to disable/re-enable and configures the features how the IDE interface displays proposed features**);
- storage for storing the selected user-selectable preference (**"system memory 102 and/or disk storage 107"** col. 4, line 44-45); and
- a stored configuration of the code assists function to display the proposed candidates for a partial program instruction according to the configuration provided by the selected user-selectable preference responsive to a parsing of a partial program instruction statement (**"upon the user's input of the dot operator, the system automatically displays list dialog 50 next to the current cursor position. Dialog 503 lists the properties, methods, and events appropriate to the class"** col. 7, line 57-60).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2191

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2-6, 8-12, and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sollich (United States Patent No.: US 6,314,559 B1).

As per claim 2:

Sollich discloses the article of manufacture as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein the list of user-selectable preferences comprises a preference for displaying a longer list of candidates responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement and a preference for displaying a shorter list of candidates responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement.

However, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that each programming language has different syntax than the other programming languages. Further more, each programmer has a different programming style when it comes to syntax and specially the complex programming language such as COBOL because it has a plurality of different syntax for one single statement. In order to fulfill the purpose of code assistant in COBOL programming language for different programmers, one would have been motivated to provide a programmer an option to select which syntax (longer or shorter) she/he prefers.

As per claim 3:

Sollich discloses the article of manufacture as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein the list of user-selectable preferences comprises a preference for displaying a longer representation of a program instruction keyword candidate responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement and a preference for displaying a shorter representation of a program instruction keyword candidate responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement.

However, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that each programming language has different syntax than the other programming languages. Further more, each programmer has a different programming style when it comes to syntax and specially the complex programming language such as COBOL because it has a plurality of way to present the keywords (full or abbreviation keywords). In order to fulfill the purpose of code assistant in COBOL programming language for different programmers, one would have been motivated to provide a programmer an option to select which style (full or abbreviation keywords) she/he prefers.

As per claim 4:

Sollich discloses the article of manufacture as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein the list of user-selectable preferences comprises a preference for displaying a full syntax representation of a program instruction verb candidate responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement and a preference for displaying a partial syntax representation of a program instruction verb candidate responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement.

However, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that each programming language has different syntax than the other programming languages. Further more, each programmer has a different programming style when it comes to syntax and specially the complex programming language such as COBOL because it has a plurality of way to present a statement (full syntax statement or partial syntax statement). In order to fulfill the purpose of code assistant in COBOL programming language for different programmers, one would have been motivated to provide a programmer an option to select which style (full syntax statement or partial syntax statement) she/he prefers.

As per claim 5:

Sollich discloses the article of manufacture as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein the list of user-selectable preferences comprises a preference for displaying a lower-case representation of a program instruction candidate responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement, a

preference for displaying a upper-case syntax representation of a program instruction verb candidate responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement, and a preference for displaying a leading upper-case syntax representation of a program instruction verb candidate responsive to the parsing of a partial program instruction statement.

However, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that each programming language has different syntax than the other programming languages. Further more, each programmer has a different programming style when it comes to syntax and specially the complex programming language such as COBOL because it has a plurality of way to present a statement (lower-case or upper-case or leading upper-case program instructions). In order to fulfill the purpose of code assistant in COBOL programming language for different programmers, one would have been motivated to provide a programmer an option to select which style (upper-case or lower-case or leading upper-case program instruction) she/he prefers.

As per claim 6:

Sollich discloses the article of manufacture as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose:

- wherein the list of user-selectable preferences comprises a programming language verb-specific preference.

However, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that each programming language has different syntax than the other programming languages. Further more, each programmer has a different programming style when it comes to syntax and specially the complex programming language such as COBOL because it has a plurality of way to present a statement (just full keywords, just abbreviated keywords, just lower-case or just upper-case or combination of upper and lower-case program instructions and so forth). In order to fulfill the purpose of code assistant in COBOL programming language for different programmers, one would have been motivated to provide a programmer an option to select which style (just full keywords, just abbreviated keywords, just lower-case or just upper-case or combination of upper and lower-case program instructions and so forth) she/he prefers.

As per claims 8-12:

- method claims, recite the same limitations as recited as in claim 2-6 above respectively, and therefore, have been addressed in connection with the rejection set forth to claim 2-6 above.

As per claim 14-18:

- computer system claims, recite the same limitations as recited in claim 2-6 above respectively, and therefore, have been addressed in connection with the rejection set forth to claim 2-6 above.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phillip H. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 270-1070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 10:00 AM - 3:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Y. Zhen can be reached on (571) 272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2191

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PN
02/22/2007


WEI ZHEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER